C. XVI. d
19
34070/B

LONG, J. SR J.

38815

A

DEFENCE

OF

JOHN ST. JOHN LONG, ESQ.

M.R.S.L., M.R.A.S., H.M.R.J.S.

IN THE CASE OF

THE LATE MISS CATHERINE CASHIN;

FOUNDED UPON

THE EVIDENCE AGAINST HIM.

BY

A GRADUATE OF TRINITY COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE, AND MEMBER OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE.

"Proprium est stultitiæ aliorum vitia cernere, oblivisci suorum.

CICERO.

"In other men we faults can spy,
"And blame the mote that dims their eye,
"Each little speck and blemish find;
"To our own stronger errors blind."

GAY.

Second Edition,

LONDON:

C. CHAPPLE, THE KING'S APPOINTED BOOKSELLER,
ROYAL LIBRARY, PALL-MALL.

1831.

[*Price One Shilling.*]

Hodgson 36[illegible]

WELLCOME
HISTORICAL
MEDICAL
LIBRARY

LONDON:

PRINTED BY J. L. COX, GREAT QUEEN STREET.

TO

THAT PORTION

OF

THE BRITISH PUBLIC

WHOSE

LIBERAL PRINCIPLES

INDUCE THEM TO

EXAMINE BOTH SIDES OF A QUESTION,

THIS PAMPHLET

IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

BY

THE AUTHOR.

INTRODUCTION.

In advancing a pamphlet before an incensed and prejudiced public, the purpose of which is the defence of one against whom a verdict of manslaughter has been twice returned, in one case by three,* and in another by two† British juries, I am aware I have imposed upon myself no ordinary task, and perhaps am exciting the enmity of a *portion* of a very learned and powerful body. But I am impelled thus to act from two of the most imperative duties; the one is, gratitude for the restoration to health of a respected relative; the other, that of private friendship.

The gentleman whose cause I would wish to advocate I have had the pleasure now of knowing some time, and in the course of our acquaintance I have perceived in him so many emanations of talent, and such frequent instances of generosity and kindness of heart towards his fellow-creatures in general, that I cannot silently see him sink under such unmerited persecution, without at least rendering my feeble aid to stem the torrent which seems threatening to overwhelm him.

My first interview with Mr. Long originated from a particular acquaintance recommending his atten-

* The Coroner's, the Grand, and the Old Bailey Jury.

† The Coroner's and the Grand Jury.

dance upon my relation for an inflammatory and most distressing complaint. My relative had received the advice of several eminent practitioners, some of whom were personal friends, who, although their skill afforded a temporary palliation to this most distressing malady, yet they did not succeed in removing the *primary* cause, as the disease returned with renewed virulence every winter. In fact, the evil, instead of retrograding, evidently increased; and I believe it was at last apparent to all his acquaintance, that unless some speedy relief had been given, it must have terminated fatally. At this crisis my relation happily applied to Mr. Long; and as it is not my intention here to enter into a detailed account of the merits of his cure, I shall only add, that I shall ever feel grateful to Mr. Long for restoring him to his family, his friends, and official duties.

My intimacy with Mr. Long commenced in my having heard that that gentleman had formerly exercised his abilities as an *historical painter*, as also that he was the intimate friend of the great Sir Thomas Lawrence. Having some taste for the arts, I therefore felt a strong desire to view his productions; and having been permitted to inspect the admirable specimens which surrounded his rooms, mostly painted by himself, I was highly gratified with them. I shortly after expressed a wish to witness his new and successful mode of treating diseases, which he very kindly complied with: and hence I am enabled to speak with more confidence on the present occasion than I otherwise could have done.

It is not my intention, in this defence of Mr. Long, to touch at large upon the case of Mrs. Lloyd; but I

shall content myself with a few remarks in the Appendix,* in order to show that nothing which has as yet transpired ought to shake the confidence of his patients. My principal object is to do away (if possible) with the existing prejudice excited by the unfortunate death of Miss Cashin, who, I understand, was a very amiable young lady, and a severe loss to her family and friends.

I would also wish to assure all those under whose eye my observations may happen to fall, that in taking up the subject as I have done, my object is to elicit truth from the evidence given *against* Mr. L., and by no means to attack the learned body of regular practitioners at large. On the contrary, it has been my happiness to have known several who are the greatest ornaments of their profession and society. Nevertheless, as in all professions, there are those who, like rotten branches on a verdant tree, unless removed by the skilful pruner, will greatly deteriorate from the beauty of the whole, and ultimately affect the trunk and root itself. I do not wish, in this appeal to the public, to detract from the personal attainments of any one, but shall merely endeavour to point out a few inconsistencies in the evidence of several medical gentlemen, who attended both on the inquest as well as at the subsequent trial of Mr Long, concerning Miss Cashin's death ; and I shall then leave it to the good sense of the public in general to judge whether I am right or not in drawing the inferences I purpose doing.

It would have been unnecessary to make any comments upon this case, had the result of the trial met the expectations of Mr. Long's friends; but the

* Vide Appendix, No. I.

eminent counsel whom he then employed felt so satisfied of the illegality of the proceeding in the first instance, and of the want of proof in the next, that they really considered it useless to expend their eloquence upon gaining such an acquittal as the case, *amply and impartially* considered, demanded. And this seemed to be the opinion of the learned judge himself, as he frequently told the jury that there was no case against Mr. Long; and in his charge so ably proved it, that nothing but extraordinary prejudice, excited by the public clamour raised against Mr. Long through the medium of the press, could have been the cause of their cruel, unmerited, and *apparently* illegal verdict.*

And here I would wish to explain, that I do not believe the whole of the jury were of this opinion, from the circumstance of their being upwards of two hours absent from court; but owing to the bad construction of English juries (which I trust our present excellent Chancellor will cause to be corrected), those who were more liberal, were, no doubt, obliged to give way to the importunities of their less sensible but more persevering brethren.

One more remark before I enter upon the facts of the case. It may be asked, and very justly, was I present at the inquest and subsequent trial of Mr. Long? I was; and, moreover, in order that I may advance nothing but the truth, I shall give all extracts from a copy which I have in my possession, taken from the evidence before the Coroner†; and as I was

* The excellent Coroner also expressed the same opinion as Judge Parke.

† In fact I have composed this pamphlet from the evidence and hints in Mr. Gurney's brief, which contained a copy of the depositions taken by the Coroner's Clerk himself, signed by each witness.

there, watching with the most intense anxiety the proceedings, I shall occasionally throw in a few observations I made upon the spot.

Thus advancing upon the only safe ground on which I could proceed, I trust that those who may read this pamphlet will perceive, that my first wish is to disabuse the public of the gross misrepresentations which have been foisted upon them respecting Mr. Long; and by thus acting, I shall best prove that I am not of the same caste with *some*, who merely stole into his confidence for the base purpose of betraying him to his illiberal persecutors :

> " An open foe may prove a curse;
> " But a pretended friend, is worse."—GAY.

OBSERVATIONS

UPON

THE EVIDENCE

DELIVERED

Before W. STIRLING, *Esquire, the Coroner for Middlesex, touching the unfortunate Death of Miss* CATHERINE CASHIN; *and a few corresponding Remarks upon the subsequent Trial of Mr.* ST. JOHN LONG.

As it is my intention to take *extracts* from the evidence, and make some observations thereon, and not to give the whole preamble of nonsense which was advanced at that extraordinary investigation, I shall introduce the witnesses in their turn as they were called before the Coroner, occasionally alluding to any remarks which transpired, which clashed with the deposition of the witness I may be more immediately treating of.

From the evidence of Mrs. RODDIS, with whom the young lady lodged, together with her mother and sister, it appeared, that Mr. Long was by no means neglectful of his patient: on the contrary, was in frequent attendance.* The principal fact which was alleged against him, and which is a disgrace to

* It appeared in Mrs. R.'s statement, that Mr. Long called four times between six o'clock on the Saturday evening, and twelve o'clock on the subsequent Monday night, *i. e.* an average of once every thirteen hours and a half.

those who support it, is, that he said " that he would " give a hundred guineas if he could produce a similar " sore upon the person of some of his patients." Now really this, to every unprejudiced mind, must appear to be the mode, or something of a similar tendency, which any *prudent* practitioner would adopt of giving confidence to his patient; and would not any medical man be considered a *fool* if he made the person labouring under a complaint acquainted with an existent danger if there was any? Again, she told him, " she had applied a poultice, and given her a " saline draught;" to which he said, " she could not " have done better." But it did not appear until the *trial* at the Old Bailey, that a great portion of *hog's-lard* was placed in the centre of this poultice. Mr. Long, no doubt, considered that the poultice meant a common bread and water, or bread and milk poultice, and not this horrible greasy mess made by Mrs. Roddis; and I think a letter, which appeared in the Morning Post on the 2d December, proves that this application produced much of the injury which ultimately caused the death of Miss Cashin.* It will, perhaps, be advanced, that Mr. Long *did know* that grease had been applied. Now I cannot affirm he did not; but I think it most likely, as he has always objected to any greasy† application: and this appears

* Vide Appendix No. II. in reference to the death of Mrs. Lloyd.

† An argument strikes me, which in some measure accounts for grease being injurious to any sore made by Mr. Long. His application removes the scarf skin, thereby leaving the true skin or flesh unprotected. In a blister this is not the case, as the scarf skin remains until the sore heals under it. Now grease when *first* applied is no doubt cooling to all sores; but, after a short time, from the heat of the body it becomes

even in the testimony of a witness against him in a late case (*viz.* Mrs. Lloyd's), for it was stated that he objected to the application of spermaceti ointment. However, admitting that he was aware of the treatment that had been made use of, it must be allowed that it was not Mr. Long who first ordered it. And let me here observe, that it is even possible Mr. Long might not be aware of the dangerous effects that his liniment, or rather a sore created by his liniment, coming in contact with grease, might produce; and even this would not deteriorate from his skill or care, as he had not been accustomed to cope with patients who resisted his mode of treatment, thereby preventing him from gaining that result, which he had been *used* to attain; for it appears that Mr. Long was very anxious to make a second application of his liniment to Miss Cashin's back, and was deterred by (unfortunately for him) a feeling of kindness: for it appears in Mrs. Roddis' evidence at *the trial,* not at *the inquest* (no, the whole truth did not come out at the inquest), that Miss Cashin said, "you shall not come near me, Mr. "Long; it is horrible, you are killing me." Accordingly he desisted; for had he acted as most regular practitioners, he would have applied what he thought proper, without asking the *patient's* leave. Had he done so, and the effect been otherwise than successful, I have no doubt the coroner's jury would have returned a verdict of *wilful murder,* so great was the *prejudice* excited against him.

rancid, and ultimately putrescent, and therefore must have a bad effect upon the sore to which it is applied; besides, it clogs the pores, and prevents a free discharge of any fetid matter that may exist.

Again, it appears in this lady's evidence, that "Mr. "Brodie was sent for, who saw her about six o'clock "in the evening, and ordered a poultice to be applied "immediately, and some saline draughts." So, Mr. Brodie, the *eminent* surgeon, orders the same, or nearly the same remedies which this "*careless*," "*ignorant*," and "*cruel quack*" had allowed to be made use of. And well he might, for, as he himself stated, "*he saw no immediate danger*,"* although he considered *mortification* did exist, or *had* existed some time previous.

The witness, Mrs. Roddis, then states, in another part, that the "deceased took a small cup of coffee "with dry toast." With all due deference to Mrs. Roddis' superior judgment, would not a cup of tea without milk, a small portion of sugar, and perhaps a tea-spoonful of brandy, have been more likely to *allay* sickness than coffee? But witness never tried the brandy until the deceased was in the agonies of death. It appears also, that "deceased had purple grapes "after the plums were discontinued." On this point, however, it is my intention to speak again in another part of this pamphlet.

One more extract from this witness's evidence before I close, which is as follows: "Mr. Long does not "usually visit his patients." This proves that, contrary to his usual custom, Mr. Long frequently called on Miss Cashin, as appeared throughout the evidence of Mrs. Roddis against that gentleman; and therefore he

* Mr. B. called at six o'clock on the Monday, and never went again until the same hour on the Tuesday. Who was the most attentive, Mr. Long, who called once every thirteen hours and a half, or Mr. Brodie who called once every twenty-four? I should think Mr. Long ought to be considered twice as attentive as Mr. Brodie.

could not be charged with neglect, paying, as he did, that attention to this case which was not his usual practice.

Mr. Brodie, the surgeon, deposed, that he "never "saw the deceased but once during her life-time;" therefore, of course, he could form no opinion whether she was ill or well when she first attended Mr. Long. Again, "witness found a slough which might be as "large as the *palm* of his hand." Now this small sore was increased afterwards by some of the witnesses on the trial to the size of a plate, the crown of a hat; by Mrs. Roddis to a piece of blotting-paper six inches by four.

But to proceed with Mr. Brodie's evidence. In the latter part of his examination he informed the coroner's jury, while upon oath, "that by slough he "meant mortification." Consequently, he found that mortification had commenced upon the back of Miss Cashin; and yet, notwithstanding this, he deposed "that, although he believed her to be very ill at that "time, he did not *see any immediate danger.*" A delicate female, with mortification commencing near the seat of life, is not then to be considered in any immediate danger! It however appears that the medical gentleman who followed him differed in opinion; for Dr. Alexander Thomson, in answer to a juror, distinctly said, "there was no mortification, no slough-"ing;" and complained much of Mr. Brodie being mentioned by the same juror *to him* as forming a different opinion, as he (Dr. T.) considered no one's evidence ought to bias his. Mr. Brodie accordingly sends the following note to Mr. Stirling, the coroner.

"Sir: I am informed that a question has arisen as "to the meaning of an expression which I used in

" giving evidence on the case of the late Miss Cashin,
" and I therefore take the liberty of troubling you with
" this letter. Perhaps you will see no objection to its
" being read to the jury.

" When I said there was a slough on the back, I
" meant that a portion of the skin was dead or morti-
" fied. I believe that this is the ordinary acceptation
" of the term, and that other surgeons as well as
" myself consider a dead part to be a slough, whether
" it remains attached to the living parts in the neigh-
" bourhood or is separated from them.

" I beg to add, that I have no reason to believe
" that either you or the jury misunderstood what I
" said on the subject at the time of my evidence being
" given.

" I have the honour to be, Sir,

" Your obedient servant,

" — Stirling, Esq." " B. C. Brodie."

How tallies this with the evidence of Dr. Thomson? who, in answer to a question put by a juryman, whether he considered any part of the back was dead previous to the young lady's dissolution, distinctly said, " decidedly not." After all this swearing to the non-existence of mortification by Dr. Thomson, and the explanation of Mr. Brodie, the latter gentleman mounts the witness's box at the Old Bailey, and swears point blank that there was mortification, or a slough or mortified part; and when the former (Dr. Thomson) was asked, on the same occasion, for the purpose of saving time, if he concurred in every thing Mr. Brodie had said, his answer was, " perfectly." Now this does not agree very well with the short extracts I have just given from Dr. Thomson's evidence on the inquest. It appeared also that Mr. Brodie " does not

"consider mulled port wine the *best* composing "draught: it might have been beneficial if deceased "could have kept it on her stomach." It then comes to this; that the port wine, for which Mr. Long has been called such a fool, is *a composing* draught, although, in Mr. Brodie's opinion, not the *best;* and he also considers that, could she have kept it on her stomach, it would have been beneficial. Now I would wish to ask, if any medical man would feel himself to blame, because he gave a medicine or potion which the patient's stomach rejected? At this rate, from Mr. Brodie's own evidence, where he says, "deceased's stomach would hardly bear any medi-"cine," *ergo,* any thing that might have been given, *even* by a *regular practitioner* in such a case, and immediately thrown up, must, by the same reasoning, dub that doctor a fool. Mr. Brodie goes on: "If "consumption threatened, remedies might be applied "to prevent it." Then it appears that the regular doctors have preventive medicines as well as poor Mr. Long! and this is corroborated by Dr. Hogg, as will appear when we come to his evidence. Ought not, then, the regular practitioners to be prosecuted for manslaughter, for allowing fifty thousand persons to die every year of consumption, when they could check the ravages of this dreadful disease by giving these preventive medicines? Again: "Inward in-"flammation in the stomach will not extend to the "back." This seems rather a new doctrine. It has generally been stated, that a disordered or inflamed stomach affected the whole frame; but if Mr. Brodie's opinion be correct, by reversing the order, external inflammation of the back would not reach to the

stomach: and yet it has been contended, that the sore produced by Mr. Long caused the inflammation of the internal parts.

I shall now proceed to the depositions of the next witness, which I consider the most important of all—Dr. Alexander Thomson.

Before commencing with this witness's evidence, it may be as well to make a few preparatory remarks. In the first place, this gentleman (commonly called Dr. Alexander Thomson) is only a Bachelor of Physic, who took his degree but recently, and is therefore not likely to have had much experience; however he has, no doubt, ability, and is a very good anatomist, as his clear description of every particular evinced. Again, he never saw the deceased while living, nor after her death until four or five days had elapsed, in which time the *body* would have altered a good deal in appearance and structure,* and consequently the *wound* itself: and this in proceeding to the evidence is proved, for he says: "On examination we found "* * * * *, &c. anteriorly over the whole of the ab- "domen and thighs, the skin peeling, apparently from "the effects of decomposition." He then proceeds with several other observations, all proving that the body had greatly altered since death: yet, as I have before mentioned, this gentleman could say, "there was no "mortification, no sloughing;" and again, that he did not consider any part of the back had become *dead* previous to the *demise of the person herself.* And now comes the most important part of all this gentleman's evidence. "The left cavity of the thorax

* Particularly as Miss Cashin died in August, the *hottest* month in the year!

" contained about *one ounce and a half* of *sanious se-*
" *rum*, but neither in its costal, diaphragmatic, or
" pulmonary portion was traversed by vessels con-
" taining red blood. The lungs of this side readily
" collapsed, and expelled the whole of the air, and
" appeared of a dark greenish blue hue exteriorly, and
" interiorly of a purple dark port wine hue appa-
" rently from *venous congestion ;* this lung had at its
" superior part a small *adhesion* connected with a *cica-*
" *trix* of the lung, arising from an old attack of *bron-*
" *chitis.* This *cicatrix* contained however two small
" *cavities* filled with *purulent fluid.* The lungs of the
" right side, while internally they were of the same
" hue and appearance as those of the left, were *every*
" where in *close adhesion* with the mediastinum dia-
" phragm and thoracic parietes, through the medium
" of the pleura, which was connected by *recent* but
" *organized adhesive bands* traversed minutely by
" longitudinal and parallel vessels carrying *red blood*
" to the costal, diaphragmatic, and mediastinal pleura.
" The lobes of this lung were *adherent* to one another
" by more *ancient adhesions ;* and at its upper part it
" contained a *cicatrix* similar in form, appearance,
" structure, and magnitude, which was about that of
" a *walnut*, to the *cicatrix* of the left lung, but con-
" taining no *recent* purulent matter."

This alone ought to be sufficient to exonerate Mr. Long from having pronounced this young lady an unhealthy subject, as every person of common sense must perceive that any one having such *unnatural* appearances in the *seat of life*, could not be in such very *robust* health as the medical and other witnesses stated.

But to proceed with the evidence. " The whole of " the lining membranes of the heart were much and " deeply stained with the blood, which in all the ca- " vities of the heart was in a state of *effervescence* " and *decomposition*. The *substance* of the *heart* was " *unusually pale* and *yellowish*, *buff in hue*, and the " *whole* more *flaccid* than *usual*."

From all this appears, the advanced state of decomposition the body must have been in when the *post mortem* examination took place, and therefore how impossible for the doctors attendant at that examination to form any idea of the cause of death. The usual mode, I believe (where there is any doubt as to the *cause* of a person's death), is to have the body opened as soon as possible. Again: " the appear- " ances internally in the abdomen and thorax were " *precisely similar* to those I found in the case of a " person who died at Chelsea from the effects of an " over-dose of *colchicum*, in a mixture containing " six ounces instead of six drachms. Any medicine " containing a preparation from the same class of " plants would produce a similar effect."

Now it is certain, or next to certain, that this young lady had not had any thing of the sort given to her. Mr. Long did not; for from the evidence of Mrs. Roddis it appeared, that he never gave Miss Cashin any medicine himself but once, which was instantly thrown off the stomach; so that, even had it contained such a preparation, it could not have caused this extraordinary appearance. Mr. Long ordered Mrs. Roddis to give some rhubarb and magnesia, which she did. Thus far Mr. Long is freed from suspicion: Mr. Brodie is also equally exculpated on this

point, as his prescription was produced and read by Mr. Foukes, who compounded it, and it was as follows:

" Six scruples of the carbonate of potash;
" Ten drops of the tincture of opium;
" Three ounces and a half of mint water;
" Three drachms of the spirit of nutmeg, with lemon " juice; to be taken in the course of thirty-six hours.
" Also,
" One scruple of the carbonate of potash;
" One drop and two-thirds of laudanum; every six " hours."

All this proves how totally impossible it was for Dr. Thomson and the other medical gentlemen who were present at the *post mortem* examination, to fix exactly the cause of death, and therefore how absurd a verdict of manslaughter against Mr. Long.

But to proceed. " I presume the *wound* on the " back was made to effect counter-irritation, which " is a *common* practice among the *junior* branches of " the profession." Soon after comes the following: " I never would have produced on the patient such a " sore, unless I wished to kill the patient. I should " have feared for the life of the patient." Now, as Dr. T. *is a junior member* of the *profession*, it follows that they sometimes wish to kill their patients; if this *be so*, I fear they will have but little practice. But again: I have no doubt it will be contended that Dr. Thomson meant, that on a *healthy* subject (although I think I have proved she was not *so very healthy*) he would not have made such a wound, unless he wished to *kill* the patient: and indeed it is only *fair* to state, that this expression of his was in answer to a juror's ques-

tion *to that effect.* Yet still the absurdity of this observation is apparent at the first glance; for he therefore owns, that according to the practice of the junior branches of the profession, he would make a wound upon a sick person, which he would think likely to kill a person in full health; *ergo*, a sick person is stronger than one in full health. There is a possibility of its being again advanced, that Dr. Thomson would have thought it unwarrantable to make so *extensive a sore* upon the back of any person, either sick or well. Granting this position, it resolves itself into a very simple argument, which is this, that by how much a person in disease was enabled to cope with the smaller sore, by so much the person in full health could withstand the larger; and it is very certain that if Dr. Thomson was to proportion his counter-irritation to the strength of the patient in a *desperate case* (and from what appeared in his evidence it is pretty clear he would only try such a remedy in a *desperate case*) to that used by Mr. Long on the person of this young lady, who was represented to be in such *sound* health, why Dr. Thomson would produce a sore about the size of a *sixpence*, as it has been shown, and will be *more fully* so by and by, that the sore produced by Mr. Long was only the size of the palm of the hand, that is, a circle of about three inches or three inches and a half diameter.

Dr. Thomson then proceeds: "I have seen a per-
"son who died, having no more inflammation of the
"pleura and pericardium or of the stomach; that is,
"taking each separately, always excepting the ap-
"pearances of the back." It will perhaps be well here to observe, that in a former part Dr. Thomson

had mentioned the existence of a slight inflammation in the pleura, pericardium, and stomach; now as *this person*, whom Dr. Thomson mentions to have seen die from such a slight cause, not having the *sore* which Miss Cashin had on her back, why can it be said it was *that* which caused inflammation to take place in the stomach of *this* young lady? What caused, then, the inflammation of the pleura, &c. of the person he has brought forward as an *example?* And now let me notice an observation which he made, which struck every observer, I am convinced, as fair, unbiassed, and manly. It is as follows: "The most *minute* examination does not enable us "to discover the cause of death in all cases." Then why in this, as it is evident *this* was a *very difficult* case? But I shall observe upon this part of Dr. Thomson's deposition again before I conclude.

These were the principal points of evidence after the first *post mortem* examination; and before I proceed to the second, I shall take the liberty of making a few remarks. During Dr. Thomson's first examination, he evinced no *apparent* prejudice towards Mr. Long; but, on the contrary, seemed to think the cause of death a very difficult and delicate point to give any opinion upon. But having finished his evidence, he requested to have the deposition of Mrs. Roddis read to him; and having heard it to an end, he raised his hand like a true *Clerkenwell Orator* and exclaimed, "I can now form an opinion, and I "will form an opinion." How does this agree with his former assertion, that the evidence of any one else *ought* not to bias his; and therefore why should he have allowed *this* to militate against Mr. Long.

On the third day of the inquest, and after the second *post mortem* examination, Dr. Thomson having mentioned that he and the other medical gentlemen in attendance found no disease either in the spine or head, on the contrary, that they appeared *very* healthy, in answer to a question by the Coroner, viz. " What is the result of all this further " investigation; what do you consider was the cause of " the death ?" Dr. Thomson answers, " I would say, " that the death arose chiefly from the *slough* on the " back, the state of the stomach, and the state of the " pleura."

Dr. Thomson, what is this ? The *slough* on the back ! Why, I thought it was stated by you, in the most *positive* manner, that there was no *sloughing*, no mortification ; and again, that there was no part which had become dead previous to the death of the person herself ; and this was said just after your explaining to the jury the meaning of *slough*, which you very properly described as " the coming away of " a dead part." I feel convinced that the evidence must be wrong here ; for I should think no gentleman of education would or could commit himself so grossly ; but, however, I can vouch for the correctness of the extract from the copy in my possession. It is very evident that this gentleman had forgot, on Wednesday (the day on which he delivered his opinions after the second *post mortem* examination) many observations he had made on the Monday before, as will appear by the following extract :—" I wish to " add to the evidence I have already given, *that it is* " *a practice with the junior members of our profession*, " and some of the seniors, *to make use of counter-*

"*irritation.* I wish also to inform you, *that no mis-*
"*take* may be entertained upon the subject, that this
"is a practice which is used by the natives of Arabia,
"and by the natives of America, by the application of
"hot iron, in order to *get rid of inflammation;* and
"the people in that country, from those applications,
"are sometimes covered all over with eschars." He also added, that he "should not hesitate to make use "of a hot iron also in some cases."—By the Coroner: "Do you think the symptoms she was labouring "under at the time rendered it improper that she "should take port wine?" Dr. Thomson: "I cer-"tainly do, because the symptoms indicated an in-"flammation of the stomach:" and yet so eminent a man as Mr. Brodie could give it as his opinion, that it might have been beneficial, could she have kept it on her stomach. She did not, however, keep it, and therefore it did no harm; and it is evident Mr. Brodie did not consider she had inflammation of the stomach, or he would never have said it would have been beneficial if retained.

I shall give only one more extract from this gentleman's evidence, and then proceed with the others. Dr. Thomson continued: "The proper mode of "treatment would have been to bleed and give calo-"mel, and to do every thing which would lower or "reduce the system." It has appeared she was so lowered and reduced already in strength—then why reduce and lower more? Not being a medical man, however, I cannot take upon myself to say that such would have been an improper mode of treatment; but I have one simple question to ask: "Did Mr.

" Brodie do this ?" No ; he evidently saw no necessity for it.

" Who can decide when doctors disagree ?"—POPE.

Before I proceed with the other medical witnesses, it may be as well to remark, that the testimony of these gentlemen ought not to have been taken regarding the cause of *death*, as they were not present at the first *post mortem* examination, when the stomach. pleura, heart, and lungs were dissected, and therefore were totally incompetent to give an opinion ; but nevertheless they did give evidence, and therefore all those points which suit this case, I shall take the liberty of using.

Mr. KING was then sworn. " The wound had the " appearance of being produced by a scorching heat. " For instance, if you held very near the skin a piece " of red-hot iron, very nearly to the extent of the " crown of a hat, for a quarter of an hour, I should " think that would have produced a similar injury." Now, even supposing Mr. Long had used such means, Dr. Thomson has already explained, that it is a warrantable practice in *some diseases.*

I shall give but two more extracts from this gentleman's evidence. In answer to a question, what he would have done had he seen the sore before her death, he said, " It would have roused me to the most " efficient mode of treatment." *Then Mr. Brodie, it seems, must have slumbered.* In answer to a question by a juror, whether Mr. King thought mortification had taken place, after giving a very clear detail of the different purposes to which the term is

occasionally applied, he added, " but *here* we under-
" stand, in *this case*, a complete destruction of the
" skin ;" that is, of course, that the skin was dead previous to the dissolution of the patient. But Dr. Thomson said that this was not the case ; and certainly he *must* be the best judge, as he saw the body two days sooner after death than the other medical gentleman, and even then he described it to be in an advanced state of *decomposition*.

Mr. WILDGOOSE, a "*rara avis*," appeared to be almost the echo of Dr. Thomson, and therefore I shall only give one extract from his evidence. In answer to a question, "Did you find any thing to warrant a belief that " the deceased was a consumptive subject?" he answered, " Yes."—" Why ?"—" We found a cica-
" trix." Dr. Thomson said *two*. However, I believe, from what I have since heard, that one is sufficient to establish the fact of the existence of the seeds of decline.

Dr. HOGG.—From this gentleman's evidence I shall only take an extract or two. " The body itself was
" not at all emaciated, but symmetrical, muscular,
" and in every respect well-formed." Again, " Upon
" removing the skull-cap, the brain presented an *un-*
" *usual firm* and healthy appearance. Portions of it
" were removed and examined as to its structure,
" and we were still more surprised at the *unusual*
" *firmness* of it throughout, and healthy appearance." Soon after, in answer to a question to what the witness attributed the death of the deceased, he answered,
" I should say that the violence done to the nervous
" system here was quite sufficient to cause death,
" *particularly* in a *nervous* and *delicate* young lady."

These assertions seem to be quite irreconcilable; for how can a *muscular* young lady, with such *unusually firm brains*, be a *delicate, nervous* young lady, unless *nervous* is to be understood in its other sense, viz. *strong*, and *delicate* to mean *handsome*. But then, taking it in that sense, it would not have produced the effect it was intended to do, *that is, an additional proof* of her incompetency to recover from the effects of the wound on her back. This gentleman also stated, that there were medicines to prevent consumption.

And now to proceed to the evidence of Dr. Goodeve. This gentleman evidently came with a perfectly unbiassed and unprejudiced mind, and expressed his opinions in a fair, generous, and at the same time, manly manner. As far as his talents are concerned, they are acknowledged to be *first-rate;* and therefore I trust the reader will not not think it irksome if I give rather *copious extracts* from his evidence. I must previously observe, the other medical gentlemen had stated there was a discoloration of the spinal chord, *opposite* the sore, upon this young lady's back. By Mr. Adolphus: "Perhaps the gen- "tleman will have the goodness to state whether that "part where *he* observed the discoloration was near "the wound, or further from it."—Dr. Goodeve: "It "was nearly opposite to the lower end of the wound: "it was all discoloured, but this was more disco- "loured than the other."—Mr. Adolphus: "Was "the spinal marrow itself discoloured?" Dr. Goodeve: "Not at all discoloured."—Mr. Adolphus: "Do "you think that the spine was discoloured from *in-* "*ternal* or *external* causes?"—Dr. Goodeve: "It is

" rather a difficult question to answer."—By a Juror: " By what means should you think that the wound " in the back was made?" Dr. Goodeve: " It is " impossible to answer that; I think it was by some " caustic, or some *acid:* it is perfectly impossible to " say what."—Juror: " Was such a wound likely to " be produced by a powerful caustic?"—Dr. Goodeve: " Yes, it was."—Juror: " Should you consider " it a rightful practice for any man to make such a " wound by any application upon a *healthy* subject?" Dr. Goodeve: " It is very warrantable to apply caus- " tic."—Juror: " Is it warrantable, by any applica- " tion, or by any means, to make such a wound upon " any patient in *good health,* as *it is represented this* " *young lady* was?"—Dr. Goodeve: " It might in " some cases be warrantable to make as large a " wound: it is a matter of opinion entirely. I do " not say distinctly whether I should or should not " make it."—Juror: " Do you think that of itself " sufficient to cause death?"—Dr. Goodeve: " *The* " *mere wound* would not be *sufficient* to *cause death,* " unless accompanied by *other symptoms.* It *might* " be sufficient to cause death, but I should think not " in *this* instance; but without knowing the whole " history, I could not answer the question."—Juror: " Could you cause such a wound upon the back of " any person without endangering the life?"—Dr. Goodeve: " Yes, I certainly think I could; for in- " stance, an extensive burn might occur upon per- " sons, but from which they would recover without " the slightest injury; a common burn; it depends " entirely on the state of health of the patient."

And now let me here observe, that no doubt this gentleman meant that a person in a healthy state would recover, while one in a contrary state of health might not; that is, the chances were more or less favourable according to the person's health. And this observation, if correct (and few, I think, would have the temerity to deny it), is another proof, or *indirect* proof, of Miss Cashin not being in that very *sound health*, and such a *strong muscular* female.

But to proceed. Juror: "Do you not think this is "of a *different kind* to a burn?"—Dr. Goodeve: "As "far as I could see, it partook very much of the cha- "racter of a burn; not made, perhaps, by fire itself, "but some other application which produces the "same result." The Juror, still boring on the *great health* of his subject, continued: "Do you think that "a surgeon might be justified in making such a "wound upon a *healthy person?*"—Dr. Goodeve: "Certainly not on a healthy person. I never said "that, I speak only of disease. I do not say a sur- "geon would be justified in doing so. I said it was "merely matter of opinion; *some surgeons might* "*choose to do so.*"

After a few observations, much to the same effect, the Juror asks a question almost the same, word for word, he had put before. Indeed, the *brilliant attempts* of some of these *wiseacres* at *cross-examination* were quite *amusing, quite récherché, quite piquant.* Juror: "Did you ever know a person hav- "ing so extensive a wound, get the better of it?" Dr. Goodeve: "I do not remember a case at this "moment."

Mr. Adolphus: "Did you ever know, sir, a sur-
"geon, for making such a wound, being indicted for
"murder or manslaughter?"—Dr. Goodeve: "Cer-
"tainly not."

After a few more observations, which went to prove that, from the partial examination he had had of the body, he should consider it was difficult to state the cause of death; but seeing *no other cause*, he could not suppose any thing but the "wound and its conse-
"quences."

Juror: "Would, in your opinion, *mulled port wine*
"be a good thing to stay the irritation of the stomach?" Dr. Goodeve: "Under some circumstances it might
"have been. *I* do not know the *state of this young*
"*lady* at the time."—Mr. Adolphus: "If she did not
"take it, it would not do her harm or good?" Dr. Goodeve, smiling: "Certainly not." A Juror: "It
"might throw some light on the judgment of Mr.
"Long?" Mr. Adolphus: "Judgment has nothing
"to do with it." A Juror (still blundering upon this unfortunate port): "We have been told that the
"stomach was very much disturbed, and would port
"wine be a good thing to stay the irritation?"—Dr. Goodeve: "I do not know the state of the
"young lady at all; the state of the pulse, and the
"fever, and other circumstances attending it." Mr. Adolphus: "Have you known, sir, medical men pre-
"scribe means *diametrically opposed* to each other
"in *several* cases?" Dr. Goodeve: "Yes: some men
"give warm and soothing things, and others cooling.
"It is *a matter of judgment* and *opinion* whether *one*
"is better than the *other:* that is, certainly, only as
"to *sick* people." After one or two observations, of

no importance to either side, this gentleman signed his deposition.

Dr. James Johnson was next called, and as he did neither *harm* nor *good* to either side of the question, I shall make no comments whatever.

Mr. Mac Kelcan was then sworn, and the only thing elicited of consequence was, that he thought the substance of the back was in a high state of disorganization. Dr. Thomson, on the Monday, had said he considered that the back was not; and Mr. Mac Kelcan, after viewing a piece which was produced, expressed the same opinion as he did now (Wednesday). Who is right and who is wrong?

Mr. T. Evans made some observations on hyperorganization and disorganization.

Thus ends the medical evidence, and I would wish now to draw the attention of the reader to this one point; the only persons who could form *any idea* of the cause of death were Dr. Thomson and Mr. Wildgoose, as they alone were present at *both* examinations of the body. I think I have proved that Dr. Thomson could *hardly* give an opinion, and Mr. *Wildgoose* did not seem to have an opinion to give.

"Nemo mortalium omnibus horis sapit."—*Pliny.*

DEFENCE OF MR. LONG,

FOUNDED UPON THE FOREGOING EVIDENCE, ETC.

In proceeding to defend Mr. Long upon the evidence *against* him, it may possibly be stated by the opposing party, that extracting mere isolated parts which are mostly favourable to him, thereby leaving many observations which occurred in the testimony of the medical gentlemen unnoticed, which had a contrary tendency, is not a *fair* mode of comment, I am aware I am presupposing an objection that may never be advanced; but feeling, as I do, the arduous task I have undertaken, *seeing the extraordinary prejudice existing in the public mind,* I am desirous of at once answering any controversy that strikes me *likely* to be started, in order to prove to every reader, that I am not so confident in the arguments I intend to produce in Mr. Long's favour, as to suppose them *all* incapable of refutation. But had I done otherwise than I have, I should tire the reader with a great deal of unimportant matter; at the same time, I have not the least hesitation in affirming, that *Mr. Long's case* would have been greatly strengthened, as any unbiassed reader of the evidence against him must perceive that discrepancies were strung as thick as the beads on the rosary pendant from the girdle of a Roman Catholic devotee. At any rate it must be allowed, that the extracts I have given are of such a

description, that any observations of a different kind which might have fallen from the witnesses, would tend the more to show how contradictory the evidence was, from beginning to end. I am inclined to think, however, nay, I am almost ready to assert, that those medical gentlemen who were attendant at the inquest and trial, were led away by *too great* an anxiety for the *public welfare*, and therefore pressed the subject beyond the bounds of prudence, as far as regarded their testimony; since no gentleman of education and science, I am well assured, would ever oppose another, as it has been imagined, merely because that other *enjoyed a superior income to himself.*

I shall now proeeed to explain the cause which first led Mrs. Cashin to place her daughter, the late Miss Catherine, under Mr. Long's medical care.

Early in June last, as nearly as Mr. Long can recollect, Mrs. and the Misses Cashin first came to his house. Their purpose was to consult him respecting Miss Ellen Cashin's health, who was then in the *last stage* of consumption. Mr. Long gave little or no hopes of a cure, but through their earnest solicitations consented to make the trial. Some time after, a Miss O'Connor, a near connection of Mrs. Cashin, came from Dublin, at *Mrs. Cashin's recommendation*, and placed *herself* under Mr. Long's care. She continued with him about a month, and left him cured, as will appear from the following note, written by Miss O'Connor to Mr. Long, dated the 4th August:

"Dear Sir:

"Deeply indebted to your valuable discovery, "that (under Providence) has been the means of res-

" toring to me the inestimable blessing of health, of " which I had been deprived for the last *four years,* " allow me to offer you my most grateful thanks, and " to join my name, very sincerely, to the number of " your truly obliged friends.

" M. J. O'Connor."

During the period of Miss O'Connor's attendance at Mr. Long's house, she asked him to tell her candidly his opinion of the eldest Miss Cashin's health. Mr. Long replied, that from her appearance he should fear her falling into a consumption before many months should elapse. Miss O'Connor *wished* him to state his opinion to Mrs. Cashin, which, from a feeling of delicacy, he declined. However, Miss O'Connor repeated this conversation to Mrs. Cashin, and the result was, that Miss Catherine Cashin (the deceased) was placed *by her mother* under Mr. Long's care.

All this was fully corroborated by the evidence of Mr. Sweetman, brother-in-law to the deceased, from whose evidence I have not yet given any extracts, as I considered they would apply better at this period of the question; I will therefore now make use of a few quotations. In answer to a question put by Mr. Adolphus: " Is it within your knowledge, that some of " the relations of this young lady died of consump- " tion ?"—Mr. Sweetman answered, " a brother* died " about a *year* ago."—Mr. Adolphus: " Has one died " since that ?"—Mr. Sweetman: " A little girl of " sixteen has died since the inquest"—By a Juror: " Was not that young lady also under Mr. Long's " care ?"—Mr. Sweetman: " It was to put her under

* Mr. L. did not attend the brother, as some of his enemies have represented.

" his care that her mother and sister left Ireland. " She was in a consumption. He said from the begin- " ning he could not undertake to cure her." He then stated, that it was by the advice of a young friend of Miss Cashin's (the deceased) that her mother placed her under Mr. Long's care. He had also mentioned in a former part of his evidence, that soon after he arrived he felt the *pulse* of Miss Cashin, " which was " about *seventy*, about as *regular as his own*, and that " her hand was *cooler than usual*:" which evidently shows, that this young lady could not have been in that state of *fever*, *irritation*, and *excitement*, she was represented to be. In answer to a question, " what is Mr. Long's fee?" he answered, " a guinea " for each patient; *but Mr. Long did not receive this* " *from Mrs. Cashin.*"

These extracts tend to prove that Mr. Long did not *himself* endeavour to persuade Miss Cashin to commence a course of attendance upon him: that being asked his opinion by another young lady concerning Miss Cashin, he merely said what struck him from his own observation: that his consenting to receive her was entirely from a wish to *benefit her*, and not from any *mercenary* motives: that previously he had taken the younger sister without expecting any credit from her, as he had pronounced her case almost hopeless! Also that consumption was an hereditary disease in the Cashin family, and therefore if he saw any symptom of a pulmonary nature, he may be justified for pronouncing Miss Cashin consumptive. And lastly, that the Cashins' confidence in him was by no means extraordinary, as he had already cured a connexion of theirs (Miss O'Connor), *under their own eyes*, of a

disease she had been afflicted with for four years; as also that they had originally come to Mr. Long through the recommendation of a Mr. Peter O'Brien, another distant connexion, who was also recovered by Mr. L. from a hopeless and reduced state of body, and is now enjoying the highest health, to the great annoyance of the *Limerick Regulars*.

It may be well here to state, that I am informed by a patient, on whose testimony I can rely, and who was attending Mr. Long at the same time that Miss Cashin and Miss O'Connor were, that the latter young lady appeared so ill when she first entered upon Mr. Long's course of practice, that her recovery seemed next to an impossibility, and that Miss Cashin was by *no means a healthly looking* girl. The one recovered, the other died. Had a regular practitioner attended, and the same results had taken place, *he* would have *been extolled* for his *cure* of the one, and never *condemned* for his loss of the other.

The object of Mr. Long's persecutors has evidently been to impress the public with a disgust for that gentleman, for having caused the death of a beautiful, *healthy*, symetrically-formed young lady. I have been informed, however, that the mark was somewhat overshot in this respect: *n'importe*, it had the desired effect upon the minds of the jurymen.*

When Dr. Thomson commenced his evidence all were on the tip-toe of expectation, for it appeared as if he had discovered the cause of such sudden disso-

* And in order to impress them still more with aversion to Mr. Long, "masses of putrid flesh" cut from the back of the deceased were handed about, until every body but the doctors themselves were almost poisoned with the revolting effluvia.

lution. Something resembling a tape-worm was seen to emerge from this gentleman's pocket; but when it was produced (oh, dreadful disappointment!) it turned out to be nothing more than a piece of common tape, neatly knotted at different distances, in order to explain to the jury that this young lady was formed according to strict "painters' proportion." It may be considered that Dr. Thomson somewhat encroached upon another's profession, since a painter would have been a more regular person to speak to this fact; but, however, I should think it signified very little whether the poor young lady was well or ill-formed, as the cause of her death was doubtful she was equally entitled to an investigation. Dr.Thomson made other observations in the course of his examination, some of which are contained in the extracts I have already given, which do not evince a superior knowledge of colours, *viz.* "greenish blue," &c. &c. It will be said, and very *justly*, this has nothing do with his attainments as a medical man. It certainly has not; but those who are so very jealous of any encroachment upon their own profession, should not dabble in another's. I do not immediately accuse Dr. Thomson of this; for, as I have before stated, I am inclined to think it was an *over-zeal* for the *public welfare* that induced him to act as he did. But there is one gentleman pretty well known to society, who assumes as many characters as Mathews or Yates, *viz.* a reformer of medical jurisprudence, a *stiff cross-examining* counsellor, a politician, a public orator, a candidate for the office of a *petty* judge, (and, had he succeeded, a *pretty* judge he would have made), a vestry reformer and the *reputed* decapitator of Thistlewood.

And all these quicker than Proteus himself; for the love of what? *not of money*, but of his country! It is reported that he once figured as a bencher in St. George's Fields. If this be true, I cannot help thinking it is a pity he ever merged *so honourable* a character in the less noble one of a self-created barrister. But perhaps the day will come when, disgusted with society for not sufficiently appreciating his services, he may again retire to the mild sequestration of that highly *honourable* and quiet station.

The public *in general*, no doubt, consider that this prosecution was instituted and supported by the mother and friends of the deceased young lady. Quite the contrary. The Editor of the Lancet was the person who took this upon himself, as appears from his own publication. He did it, no doubt, with an intent to *serve his country;* but never did patriot before grumble so much at being obliged to expend £30 or £40 for that purpose. I say £30 or £40, since he is likely to receive, if he has not done so already, the greater portion of the money advanced by him out of the fine paid by Mr. Long. If medical men undertake the prosecutions of Mr. Long—if medical men undertake to act as counsel—if they try to influence the judges and to manufacture law for the occasion—it will be pretty evident that *patriotism* has but little to do with their zeal. I should not have alluded to the Editor had he not taken so active a part in the proceeding against Mr. Long.

"Non solum interfuit his rebus, sed etiam præfuit."—CICERO.

That Mr. Long's system is founded upon the most *simple* and *scientific* principles, I think a very few ob-

servations will amply prove. His *principal*, although not only modes of cure for consumption, are by *inhalation*, and a *counter-irritant* by an external application. Is this to be called unscientific? then the remedies of the regular practitioners are equally so. Why do physicians order consumptive patients into Devonshire, to Lisbon, to Madeira, and even to India? In order that they may breath a purer air. Mr. Long's system is to give the patient, as it were, this artificial air to inhale,* which, he has often explained, has the effect to ripen any ulcers that may exist, and enable them to be thrown off the lungs with greater ease. And now let me ask, whether it is consistent with common sense to suppose any *medicine* can act so well upon the lungs as *inhalation?* Again, why do medical men make use of blisters, setons, issues, and a preparation of tartar emetic, but for the purpose of drawing, by counter-irritation, an internal disease (according to sympathetic attraction) to the surface? Mr. Long only professes to do this by his application. But here lies the sore point. Mr. Long *has* discovered a preparation which will have no effect where there exists no disease, as appears in a letter I have already referred to, and which fact was fully borne out by seventeen witnesses at the inquest;† and the case is

* It may be urged as an argument against this explanation, that the patients only inhaled this pure air during their stay at Mr. Long's house each day, and then returned into the less salubrious atmosphere of London streets. At this rate, sick persons should not take an airing, because they will have to return home perhaps in a short time. Besides, Mr. L.'s inhalation being chemical, it is likely to be of more use in an hour than the air of India, &c. may be in a day or week.

† There were sixty-three patients all ready (had they been called) to attest the same fact.

apparent at once, since *many* patients apply the remedy with their own hands when the sore is within their powers of application (*viz.* either the chest or stomach), and therefore their hands would be completely flayed if the preparation was so very *corrosive*.

And here it will, perhaps, be considered by the readers, that I have been endeavouring to pluck out the mote in my brother's eye without perceiving the beam in mine own eye; that is, by accusing some medical gentlemen of encroaching upon another's profession, while I am committing the same fault, by arguing upon a point of medical treatment. But when I explain that I have by me the observations and arguments of a *first-rate medical man* upon the very case I am advocating, and which I shall not fail to use as a weapon of defence if I find it necessary, I may be considered as only advancing a true medical *opinion*. The observations I allude to, after proving most satisfactorily every thing advanced, concludes with this result:

"1st. That the sore on deceased's back was not mortified."

"2dly. That if even it was mortified, it was not the cause of her death."

"3dly. That *congestion* in her lungs, from an affection in the stomach, *was* the cause of her death."

"4thly. That Mr. Long's practice is *built* upon *scientific principles.*"

"5thly, and lastly, That new discoveries have ever met with opposition."

Another objection I have also heard started against Mr. Long, *viz.* his professing to cure so many dis-

eases by one method. The gentleman whose remarks I have just referred to, entirely exonerates him from any quackery on this point, since he enumerates no less than thirty-seven *principal* disorders, with others for which the regular practitioners adopt one mode of treatment, *viz. counter-irritation.** In fact, it is well known that many of the *mostly used* remedies by medical men of the present day originated with persons they were pleased to call quacks. For instance, mercury; the safe use of arsenic; and others; and was Mr. Long to give up his nostrum, hundreds would, I venture to affirm, come forward, and declare they considered it a most useful discovery, and that they were sorry he had suffered so much. And had they waited, I have reason to think it was his intention in good time to have done so; but I know Mr. Long's bold and manly spirit will never suffer persecution to *wring* it from him.

I shall now proceed to notice the *foolish, scurrilous,* and *false attacks* that have been made on Mr. Long's origin; and, for the sake of argument, will even admit them to be true for the present, in order to prove that they do not militate against Mr. Long in any one point of view. To proceed, then, with these *elegant* compositions: they describe him as being the son of a basket-maker; that he followed the business some time, but evincing a *superior* talent for painting, he took up that profession; that finding (observe) *his miserable productions* would not shield him from *want,* he takes a house *in Harley-street,* and commences

* Experiments in it are also tried by the Regulars, as will be seen in the Appendix. No. V.

*Quack Doctor.** Now, *lie* is written legibly on the face of such a representation; for is it likely that the man who evinced so *superior a talent for painting* should produce such *miserable performances* as not to be able to live by them, and in this state of *beggary* to take a house in *Harley-street, which must have required some funds to support until his practice proved succesful.*

The day may come, perhaps, when it will be worth while to give Mr. Long's life in full, I will therefore observe but slightly upon it now; nevertheless I will point out some particulars. *He is not* the *ignorant, illiterate, impudent blackguard,* that his enemies represent him to be.† He has, as I have before stated, been an *historical painter,*‡ and was also the intimate friend of Sir Thomas Lawrence, who, I think, would never have received him as such had he been so *wretched a dauber.* In prosecuting this profession, he was obliged to dissect, and that frequently, under the eye of Mr. Dermot, at Guy's Hospital. This was fully corroborated by a physician of great eminence, residing in London, who attended to give evidence that, had it been produced, would have at once checked any further proceedings against Mr. Long; but Mr. L.'s counsel omitted to call for it, never expecting, as I have before stated, so absurd a verdict as was given. His evidence would have been to the following effect: That *he,* when first he heard of this case

* They have also denominated him a carpenter, a stone-mason, a valet, a messenger (*i. e.* Αγγελος an angel), a zink-worker, a sign-dauber, a house painter, &c. &c. &c. Certainly he must be a clever man to assume so many characters, and all in such a short time.

† Vide Appendix, No. IV.

‡ Mr. Long gained a medal at the Royal Society for a composition.

of Mr. Long's, felt indignant, considering that he was an ignorant, unscientific pretender; but upon reconsideration, the name struck him as familiar, and he remembered that a gentleman of the name of Long had been pointed out to him, by Mr. Dermot, as a *most talented character*. He accordingly called upon Mr. Long, and, in the presence of several most respectable patients, shook Mr. L. most cordially by the hand, saying, that he attributed the success of many of his pupils to Mr. Long's generosity, in having given up to them subjects (which he had previously dissected, and had purchased at a very great expense) for their use and information. *All this was done by this poor, beggarly, starving wretch, before he took up the profession of a quack!* It may be as well to state that this medical gentleman is a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, as well as Lecturer on Anatomy; and that he said, to a young gentleman *in Mr. Long's own house* (observing some pictures in an ante-room which the same young gentleman *had seen Mr. Long painting* some time before) developing the heart, lungs, and organs of the stomach, "How beautifully Mr. Long "pourtrays internal anatomy!" The question was put—"Do you *really* think so?"—He answered, "I "do."—"Then," said the other, "I asked the ques- "tion, as I am not sufficiently acquainted with the "interior organs of the body to be a judge myself."

This, I trust, will prove to the public Mr. Long is not so ignorant of the *rudiments* of his present profession as some have represented him to be.*

* Mr. L. was (previous to his undertaking to cure diseases) elected *by ballot* a member of the Royal Society of Literature, as also of the Royal Asiatic Society, and received marks of distinction from institutions of a superior caste.

But even supposing it true that Mr. Long was lowly born, would that deteriorate from either his talents or character? Is Sir Isaac Newton's Principia less conclusive because he was a plough-boy, or his title less honourable because he did not receive it by inheritance? Is Dr. Hutton less to be respected as a mathematician, because he was in youth a poor boy who drove the coal-carts up from the mine? Do Shakespeare's works contain less talent because he was a deer-stealer? Or was Bonaparte an inferior general from having drawn breath in a remote part of Corsica? Or Kirk White less *amiable* because the son of *a butcher?*

I shall now observe upon a few of the contemptible attacks that have appeared on his character and connexions. Some ignorant booby, who signed himself "M. D. in the United Kingdom," (but who, more likely, was an apprentice to a pettifogging apothecary), in order to show his learning, compares Mr. Long to Molière's Sganarelle. The absurdity and ignorance of such a comparison is apparent, since Sganarelle appears to be a faggot-binder, who, by *force* is compelled to act *the Doctor* against *his own will*, and accordingly he is represented by Molière as prescribing many absurd things, which he considered the regular doctors likely to have ordered in such cases. This admirable satirist, therefore, evidently intends *this* as a ridicule of medical men, not of quacks. The practice of Le Sage's Sangrado is also produced as a simile by this Colossus of Literature. Truly this *is a very happy* idea, when it appears that Sangrado was a physician who ordered copious *bleeding* and *warm water* for all his patients, and Mr. Long is known to be *opposed to bleeding*, and always de-

sirous for his patients to *live well.* As the gauntlet has been thrown by Mr. Long's enemies, as far as the introduction of Molière, I shall throw in any quotation from that author, I think likely to apply. The Editor of the Lancet (a *puny instrument* of attack), after numerous invectives of the most insulting, yet contemptible description, makes the following observation: "Accordingly, at the in-
"quest, we were anxious to obtain from Long's
"own witnesses, what was his opinion (if the fellow
"be equal to connect two ideas upon a medical sub-
"ject) of the cause of Miss Cashin's death; and by
"constantly directing our attention to this one point,
"we at last elicited from one of his own witnesses,
"Mrs. G—— S——, that Long had told her that
"Miss Cashin died from an *inflammation of the sto-*
"*mach.* This was a fact of great importance; for
"here we had direct evidence of the wretch's brutal
"ignorance of even the rudiments of medical prac-
"tice. What said Mrs. Roddis: 'Long directed me
"to give the deceased a tumbler full of mulled wine.'
"What said Long to Mrs. G—— S——? 'The de-
"ceased had inflammation of the stomach.' And
"what was the monstrous remedy? A tumbler of
"mulled wine!"

I should never have thought it worth while to take notice of any thing else in this periodical; but as this attacks Mr. Long upon his knowledge, and is likely to mislead, I will state how Mr. Long came to give such an opinion. The fact is, he was as much surprised as Mr. *Brodie* at the sudden death of Miss Cashin (and that Mr. Brodie was surprised, is proved by being *twenty-four hours* before he again visited his patient). Mr. Long, therefore, *not being allowed*

to be present at the *post mortem* examination, could only form an opinion on the report of the evidence which was occasionally carried to him by his friends. Being asked, therefore, by a patient, to what he attributed Miss Cashin's death ? he answered, " I sup- " pose the inflammation which appears to have ex- " isted in the stomach." If Mr. Long was faulty in ordering port wine, he is exonerated by Mr. Brodie, when he says, " it would have been beneficial " could she have retained it." And let me ask, *does it never happen* that the first-rate physicians will find after death they have mistaken a case, and administered the most improper medicines ? And yet are they called " wretches," " felons," and " ignorant brutes ?" They may, perhaps, by the Lancet editor ; but the word of that man, who is a general slanderer, is not the value of a straw in the scale of justice.* The fact is, the Editor wishes to become the people's orator, as he has once or twice shown, but has not produced the same amicable results as Virgil so beautifully describes :

" Ac, veluti magno in populo cum sæpe coorta est
" Seditio, sævitque animis ignobile vulgus ;
" Jamque faces et saxa volant ; furor arma ministrat ;
" Tum pietate gravem ac meritis si fortè virum quem
" Conspexêre, silent, arrectisque auribus adstant ;
" Ille regit dictis animos, et pectora mulcet."

* The Editor has been fined for several libels. He does not consider the College and Apothecaries Hall examinations at all a safeguard to society. He has often proclaimed in his publication, that their respective boards were totally inadequate to examine ; called the Members of the College of Surgeons' board, " old women and dowagers," and those belonging to the Apothecaries Hall, " the old bags at Rhubarb Hall." He has often stated in his Journal that they *murdered* their patients ; and that pupils who were rejected at the College in Dublin and Edinburgh for *incompetency*, came here the same week and passed with éclat.

But suppose any cruel person was to give it out that the Editor's house in Argyle-street, which was burnt down in so unhappy and mysterious a way, owed its devastation to him; or, that a servant of his threw herself off from the top of the house, and had been out of her mind ever since, for whom he had done nothing at all under her distressing situation; or again, that he took a cottage after his misfortune, and decamped *sub lunâ*, leaving the house in the greatest possible state of dilapidatiou, and the rent unpaid; why all these would be vile slanders, and therefore he should be a little tender of other people's feelings, as he would not like such usage himself.

Mr. Long's professing to cure diseases which the faculty pronounce incurable, seems to be a great objection with the public in general, as Eraste in Molière observes:

"Un malade ne doit point vouloir guérir, que la faculté n'y consente."

Mr. Long's patients have also been abused, and called *fools* and *dupes*. Amongst the many dangerous cases which have come under Mr. Long's care, none were more so than that of John Braithwaite Esq., the civil engineer. It was considered by the faculty he could not live. His malady was an affection of the bronchia: he was by Mr. Long perfectly restored.* Is it likely, let me ask, that a man of superior talent and science, and from whom the country has receivedso many useful inventions, and expect so many more; is it likely, I say, that a gentleman of his attainments would not have discovered Mr. Long ere this if he were an impostor? Or how can it be said that such numbers

* Vide Appendix No. III.

of highly respectable witnesses, many holding the first rank in the country, should *all* be dupes? Besides, an argument strikes me as very much in Mr. Long's favour, *viz.* that most of those patients who have stood the firmest by him are either Irish or Scotch. The Irish are known to be a very shrewd people, not easily deceived; but the Scotch have ever been proverbial for their wariness, almost to a man; it is their characteristic. The press talks about the gullibility of John Bull. Now John Bulls form a very small part of Mr. Long's patients, and those he has are mostly from the north, where they are not noted in general for being fools. But who can *wonder* at Mr. Long's persecutions! the brightest character that ever stept was persecuted, even unto death. His cures were all *perverted*, but they were not the less *complete:* they were *miraculous*, yet they were not the less *certain*. In one of these miracles, St. John, speaking of the Pharisees:

"Then again called they the man that was blind, and said unto him, "give God the praise: we know that this man is a sinner.

"He answered and said, whether he be a sinner *or no*, I know not: "one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see."

Mr. Long does not pretend to miracles; he gives his mode of practice, which has been proved by no means an uncommon one, he only withholds his preparations. That he has effected extraordinary cures I will defy any one to contradict; and are those who have received that benefit they never experienced before, to think the less of him because he is called a quack? The idea is grossly absurd. A little repartee made by the friend of Mr. Oughton, Jun., of Manchester (who had attended Mr. Long for *consump-*

tion, and entirely recovered, after being considered incurable by some very eminent men) will perhaps come in well here. That gentleman had just returned to his home quite cured, when some one observed: "Ah! Mr. Long has only patched him up."—"Never "mind," said his friend, "they could not patch him "here." This piece of patch-work, however, has lasted two years; and bids fair to last many more.

The editor of the Medico-Chirurgical Review is also an avowed enemy of Mr. Long; in one article he speaks of him as a person partaking more of the "monkey than the man." The fact is, the editor judges of other people by *himself:*

"He is like unto a man beholding his *natural face* in a glass: for he "beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what "manner of man he was."—Gen. Epist. of James.

Indeed, there have been no attacks upon Mr. Long which have appeared yet, that possess the least reason or justice about them. None of Mr. Long's opponents, I will venture to affirm, will ever be hung for Thames' arson, for a pamphlet came out some months ago, in which the whole wit seemed to consist in representing that

"A young lady went from Newington Butts,"
To consult Mr. Long for a pain ———

Delicacy forbids my completing the rhyme.

I should never have mentioned editors, pamphlet-writers, *or any other writers*; but "men have got a "fashion now-a-days, that two or three *busy bodies* "will take upon them the name of the world, and "broach their own conceits as if they were a general "opinion."—*Bacon.*

CONCLUSION.

The reader will perceive from the foregoing arguments, that I have endeavoured to defend Mr. Long *almost* entirely upon the evidence *against* him, as I was well aware that such was the prejudice existent, that any depositions of his friends would be considered generally as only proceeding from *dupes* or *liars*. The former title has been applied unsparingly to those most respectable, and many noble personages, by the public press; and the latter has been once or twice pretty broadly hinted at. Allow me to ask, whether the oaths of persons of character—of education—of rank—and having no *sinister motives*, are not to be considered as valid as those of *Other Persons?* It was said in one paper, that the attainments of the nobility were considerably below par at the present day. It is evident that the writer of this lampoon must have been some poor wretch who never travelled beyond the precincts of Grubb Street, as had he visited the universities, he would have seen many members of the first families in Great Britain bearing away some of the most distinguished honours. Besides, I have already pointed out one gentleman who was a patient of Mr. Long's, and whose talents are sufficiently before the public; and now I will mention another, who, if any thing, was *less likely* to be deceived than Mr. Braithwaite. I mean Mr. Porter, who was surgeon-

general at Jamaica for twenty-two years. This gentleman made an ample fortune in the West-Indies by the discovery of a mode of cure for yellow fever, and was at first nearly as much opposed as Mr. Long; with this exception, that there were no trials, nor could they accuse him of not being regularly educated.

But there are some points that have already been named that I am anxious to draw the observation of the reader more particularly to. It is a well known fact, that of all fruit, plums are perhaps *nearly* the most injurious. That Miss Cashin had eaten plums is proved by an extract from Mrs. Roddis's statement, which I have already given, *viz.* "the deceased had "purple grapes after *the plums were discontinued.*"

It could have been proved upon the trial by three or four most respectable witnesses, that these were a favourite fruit* of the Misses Cashin, but as they were not called, this will be considered no defence of Mr. Long. I will therefore proceed now entirely upon the depositions of the witnesses *against* him, none of whom were cross-examined except Mr. Brodie. Had they been, their evidence would have been blown to "shreds and patches." Mr. Brodie had but one question asked by Mr. Gurney, which was as follows:— "Mr. Brodie, do you not consider the sore would "have grealty altered in a week's time?" Mr. Brodie, hesitating, "no, certainly not—not at all." The object of this question is evident; for every unbiassed medical man I have spoken to upon the subject has declared, that the *post mortem* examiners could not (so long a time after death as a week) form any opinion of

* Plums have been known to produce death through sickness and inflammation of the stomach, without any other *apparent* cause.

the state of the sore while the patient was alive; but if Mr. Brodie *be correct*, then in a week's time *the body itself* would not alter. Again, *if there was no alteration at all in the body in a week*, there could be none in *a month*, *a year*, &c. *ad infinitum;* and, by such reasoning, corruption has ceased to visit human nature. It will perhaps be considered, that Mr Brodie meant merely as to *visual appearance;* but I beg to observe, that the question by the learned counsel entirely related to the *structure of the parts.* But Dr. Thomson has already proved that the body was in a *rapid* state of decomposition, and therefore the sore which formed part of that body must have been so in a greater degree, because Mr. Brodie swore that even in life-time the part was sloughing: a term which he explained was synonimous with mortification; while Dr. Thomson swore there was "no slough-"ing, no mortification, no part that had become dead "previous to the death of the patient."

I will now observe slightly upon a few other points of consequence. It appears from the evidence of the opposing witnesses, that the wound was only the size of the palm of the hand. Alice Dyke, Mr. Long's own servant, fully corroborated this statement. The inflammation had perhaps extended, and after death putrified, which no doubt a good deal misled the *post mortem* examiners. Dr. Thompson *owned* "that the most *minute examination* did not enable "them to decide *in all cases.*" Again, Mr. Long had pronounced deceased consumptive, of which there appears pretty good proof, or at any rate she was not that *very healthy* subject, having, as has been stated, venous congestion, purulent matter, two cicatrices,

and numerous adhesions in the lungs, and the remains of an old attack of bronchitis. That the spinal marrow was not injured, it has also been stated, and therefore the effects of the *wound* could not have gone so *very deep*. And lastly, that the jury declared, on the very first day of the inquest, before the body had been opened, that *they* had entirely made up their minds; and had it not been for Mr. Porter, the surgeon, whom I have named already, they would have returned a verdict of manslaughter against Mr. Long, without even hearing anything that might be advanced in his favour. Is this English justice? is this English freedom? No: it resembles more the speech of a Spanish inquisitorial conclave, or the founders of a Bastile.* What can be more absurd, what more unjust, or more cruel, than the returning a verdict of manslaughter against Mr. Long, who *evidently wished* to do Miss Cashin a service, even supposing he was *mistaken;* when the papers teem every day with accounts of men murdering their wives, wives their husbands, parents their children, by starvation and ill-usage, and yet the juries bring in their verdict *only manslaughter!* Indeed, there has lately appeared a new sort of verdict, for one who died from being knocked down "for a lark," viz. *excusable homicide!* and the reason given by the sapient jurors was, that there existed no malice prepense. I am certain there did not; but I am equally convinced this explanation would apply to Mr. Long and the deceased!

* There never was a more disgusting or disgraceful scene than this inquest; every thing urged in Mr. L.'s favour was received with groans and hisses, whilst vulgar plaudits burst from the opposing party when any observation was advanced against him!!!

The prejudice that is evidently raised against Mr. Long, whilst the press have been giving to the public every thing that could prevent the slightest chance of an unbiassed trial, is a disgrace to England and to Englishmen. Such conduct would have been reprobated towards a murderer, a plunderer, an incendiary. Mr. Long is none of these; but he has been guilty of a more heinous crime—he has dared *to cure* those that were pronounced *incurable!!!* A surgeon of first-rate talent and experience, speaking the other day of Mr. Long, made the following liberal observation: "*I know* that Mr. Long has "performed most extraordinary cures, nay, even mi- "raculous,and therefore this is evidently a most cruel "persecution of a man of talent."

It is also supposed, and I believe very erroneously, that Mr. Long has been making so enormous an income for the last three or four years, that in fact he rolls in gold. I cannot take it upon myself to say what has been his gains; but this I know, that Mr. Long has been so generous in taking many patients for *little or nothing*, that his receipts cannot have been what has been stated.

And now, for the last and most important point of all in this proceeding. It will be remembered that Mr. Long had under his care, for about six weeks, the younger sister of the deceased. She, during her attendance, had her back rubbed several times. Mr. Sweetman, in his evidence, said, he was told that Miss Ellen had an excoriation upon her back. Now, if Mr. Long's liniment was this dreadfully *corrosive* preparation, she would have been completely devoured before the other sister was taken

ill. If the same appearances had existed in Miss Ellen's case as in Miss Cashin's, there is not a doubt it would have been mentioned upon the inquest, so anxious were they to criminate Mr. Long; but nothing of the kind existed. And why? because Miss Ellen was rubbed often, and therefore as the acrid humour collected it was drawn off: but in Miss Cashin's case she was rubbed but once, and therefore all the peccant matter, no doubt, was attracted to that part, and not being extracted she suffered much pain and uneasiness, and after death it putrified.

I shall now close this case, trusting that a discerning public will perceive that Mr. Long is the victim of persecution; and even if he were the cause of this young lady's death, yet he would only have been guilty of a professional mistake, (which any other medical man might have committed,) and not the perpetrator of a felony.

"Qui alterum accusat probri, eum ipsum se intueri oportet."

PLAUTUS.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

I SHALL say but little upon the approaching trial of Mr. Long, in the case of the late Mrs. Lloyd, as the eminent counsel he has retained will, I am convinced, do ample justice to their client; but I shall mark one or two points for the consideration of the reader.

Mrs. Lloyd was never rubbed but once or twice. The skin was but *barely* broken. She was taken out of Mr. Long's hands and placed in others. In the course of ten days, while under the regular surgeon, mortification commenced. Mr. Vance was then called in, and in about a month from the time of her first applying to Mr. Long she died. Mr. Long had begged to be allowed to see his patient several times, and was refused. What man can answer for the death of his patient under such conflicting circumstances? It also ought to be remembered, that during his attendance upon this lady, he was suffering the greatest anxiety for the event of his approaching trial, and actually was in confinement during two or three days of the most important part of her illness. Would any medical man (let him be ever so eminent), I would ask, possess all his energies under such disadvantages? *No! but Mr. St. John Long is not to be benefited by the same allowance that would be granted to Others!!!*

Note.—I mean to treat upon this case *fully* after Mr. Long's trial, in which the evidence is still less conclusive against him than in Miss Cashin's.

No. 2.

[From the Morning Post of the 2d December 1830.]

TO THE EDITOR.

November, 1830.

Sir;

It is a source of sincere gratification to the friends and patients of Mr. St. John Long, to observe by your Paper of the 19th instant, the admission of a sensible and well-written letter from that gentleman in reference to the late Coroner's inquest on the death of Mrs. Lloyd, because it will prove to his virulent persecutors, his friends, and the public at large, that *your* Paper (with a few others) is conducted on the broad and liberal principle of *audi alteram partem*. Having myself received incalculable benefit from Mr. Long's mode of treatment, between the months of November 1828 and April 1829, and having been upon terms of friendship with him since that period, and a frequent visitor and eye-witness of the cure of various diseases, in a number of highly respectable patients, and having also attentively watched the progress of their convalescence from the commencement of his application to the completion of their cure, I feel that it is a duty I owe to a cruelly persecuted fellow-subject of this free, enlightened, and happy country, as well as a debt of gratitude I owe to Mr. Long, to become his public apologist, although it is my lot to move in a far humbler station of life than many of his noble patrons and patients; and were I at this time to remain silent, and allow the man who has (under Providence) restored me to health and usefulness, to sink under the weight of such an accumulating combination of enmity, persecution, and unmerited obloquy, I should hereafter feel that I had been guilty of the most contemptible pusillanimity, and should consider myself de-

graded to the ignominious level of a spy, *as there have been several,* from the enemy's camp.

But, Sir, I have been impelled to address you from another most paramount duty to the public in general, and to those patients in particular who may hereafter suffer from too great an excitement and irritability under Mr. Long's application; and hence, becoming alarmed, may be induced to tamper with themselves in the first instance, and, failing of success, may subsequently call in their usual medical advisers, who, however skilful, seem to be confounded at the appearance of the eruption and sore, and at any rate do not appear alive to the most simple, decisive, and innocent mode of treatment; and I venture to affirm, that if, after the information I am about to give from personal experience and practice, in a late case of my own, any other mode should be adopted of controlling the effects of Mr. Long's liniment, the death of the patient will not lie at his door, but must be attributable to subsequent mismanagement after he is dismissed.

I must beg leave to premise, that in consequence of close attendance at my office for nearly twelve months, during which I had but little opportunity for recreation, I experienced a great weight and uneasiness, with considerable heat and inflammation about the head, or what is usually denominated determination of blood to the head; and therefore, in the beginning of October, I obtained leave of absence from the office for three weeks or a month. I then made up my mind to attend Mr. Long, in consequence of the benefit I had received under his treatment two years ago. By reference to a diary which I have long kept, I find my first visit to him was on the morning of Saturday, the 9th October last; and here I must beg to draw your attention as I proceed to the strange coincidencies between Mrs. Lloyd's case and my own; with this difference, that I applied to no medical man whatever, and soon recovered. On seeing Mr. Long on the 9th October as before stated, (the same day Mrs. Lloyd attended him,) he advised me first

to inhale, and then to be rubbed on the nape of the neck to between the shoulders; and having upon a former occasion, for spasmodic affection of the chest and gout, submitted to the same discipline at least thirty times, and being satisfied that there was nothing corroding or eroding (as Mr. Brodie calls it) in the application, I immediately ordered the attendant to rub me, and he applied the liniment with so gentle a friction to what I had formerly been accustomed, that I expressed a doubt of its efficacy. Mr. Long then looked at my back, said it was enough, and ordered the cabbage-leaf to be put on; after which I took the same sponge, squeezed it out, and then, with the remainder of the liniment, *nearly half a saucer-full*, I sponged my head, face, eyes, and behind the ears, for ten minutes, thoroughly, without producing the slightest rash; on the contrary, I felt exceedingly refreshed, and relieved from the weight and oppression about my head. I then walked home, and applied fresh cabbage-leaves at night, and during the following Sunday. On Monday morning, the 11th, I called again at Mr. Long's, when he examined my back, and ordered it to be merely washed with his liniment *round* the sore, but not to touch that part that was raw, as the discharge was sufficient. I called again on Tuesday the 12th, and Wednesday the 13th of October, continuing the inhaling, washing, and the renewal of fresh leaves. On Wednesday, the 13th, I dined at the London Tavern, in consequence of an invitation with which I had been honoured: and although I had then been four days and nights under the operation of Mr. Long's DREADFULLY *corroding* and *eroding* liniment (as his enemies term it), no person appeared to have an idea that any thing was the matter with me. On Thursday, the 14th October, I attended again, and went through the same course; but on this day, although my back was very sore, I took a long walk. On Friday, the 15th, attended Mr. Long, went through the same routine, and walked a considerable time about the Regent's Park before I returned home. But now, Sir, mark particularly what follows.

On Saturday, the 16th, I went to Mr. Long, and informed him that my back was very sore and irritable; he desired me by no means to attempt healing it up, but to keep up the discharge by a frequent renewal of fresh cabbage-leaves. After inhaling as usual, I very incautiously took a longer walk than I had been accustomed to for some years, viz. at least six or seven miles out and home. Here you will perceive another strong coincidence between Mrs. Lloyd's case and mine: for it appears by the evidence of Mrs. Elizabeth Campbell, the mother of the Surgeon, in answer to a Juryman, "that she (Mrs. Lloyd) had walked a *considerable distance* with the witness on the very day before she was taken so seriously ill." Now, in consequence of my having over-walked myself, my back became highly inflamed; I felt jaded and fatigued with my walk, and I passed a very restless and almost sleepless night.

On the following morning, Sunday the 17th of October, the inflammation ran very high, when I ordered the cabbage leaves to be removed, and the following simple poultice to be applied to my back, namely, the crumb of a soft loaf to be cut of sufficient size to cover the wound and the surrounding inflammation; some milk and water, half and half, to be boiled and poured upon the bread, and the bread allowed to swell and become soft and pliable without separating, the liquid to be sufficiently expressed to prevent its running down the back, and a little elder-flower water to be poured over that part of the poultice which was to lie next the back. This poultice was laid on as warm as I could bear it; in less than half an hour all that scorching heat and irritation (arising very much from over-fatigue the day before) gradually subsided, and I had a comfortable and refreshing sleep for nearly three hours. At one o'clock in the day the poultice was renewed, when the inflammation appeared considerably reduced; the pores being kept warm and open, discharged a considerable quantity of morbific humour. Another poultice was then applied, and towards night the inflammation and irritation was so subdued, and I felt myself so per-

fectly easy, that I ordered some common *spermaceti ointment* to be spread on linen, and to be applied to the sore to heal it up. Here is a third strange coincidence between Mrs. Lloyd's case and mine, for it appears in the evidence of the first surgeon, Mr. Campbell, before the Coroner, "that he took away the cabbage leaves, and dressed the wounds with common *spermaceti ointment*." I will now state what was the baneful effect of this greasy plaster to my back. In the first place the inflammation and irritation returned rapidly and with redoubled virulence, attended with considerable fever and thirst; the glands about the neck and throat became swollen, hard, and sore to the touch, and I passed a restless and sleepless night. In the morning I ordered the spermaceti plaster to be removed, when it was found that several ulcers had formed during the night upon the excoriated part. I then ordered the former poultice to be resumed, and in about half an hour I fell asleep, and remained perfectly easy and comfortable until one o'clock in the day. The poultice was then repeated, as also the last thing at night, after which I slept the whole night undisturbed. In the morning the poultice was renewed, and repeated during the day. Towards evening the inflammation was completely subdued, leaving nothing but the ulcer to be healed. I therefore continued the poultices during the next day, Wednesday, the 20th of October, when the ulcer also healed; and on Thursday morning, the 21st, I paid a visit to Mr. Long, and informed him what had occurred since I saw him on Saturday, the 16th of October last; and when I attended at Mr. Long's trial on the unfortunate death of Miss Cashin, I was perfectly well.

I fear, Sir, I have trespassed too much upon your valuable columns, but I trust I have proved that Mr. Long's liniment is not of that *corroding* or *eroding* quality, if left to work itself out, but that it is to be controlled by the most simple and *cheapest* poultice: and I think I have proved beyond contradiction, that the whole mischief, with reference to the unfortunate death of Mrs. Lloyd, has arisen from greasy plasters, and other

opposing preparations; for it does appear in evidence that Mrs. Lloyd herself applied greasy plasters, and she acknowledged to Mr. Long that she applied Turnour's Cerate, and from the appearance of the chest, when Mr. Long was permitted to see her for the last time, he is convinced that she must have used blistering or fly ointment, such as apothecaries use for keeping a common blister open; and this appears to have been corroborated by Captain Lloyd's own evidence, wherein he states "that where the matter rested it caused *fresh blisters*, some of which he cut to relieve her pain, as she complained all over." Now I do aver, that among all the patients I have seen, and from personal experience, Mr. Long's liniment never produced fresh blisters from the discharge touching a sound part in the neighbourhood of the wound itself. From the foregoing statement no other conclusion can be drawn than that Mrs. Lloyd, most incautiously and unfortunately in the first instance, added considerably to the inflammation on her chest by over-walking and fatiguing herself the day before she was taken so ill; that she then applied greasy plasters, and probably blistering ointment, which Mr. Long objected to. The cabbage leaves were then replaced; that she then sent for Mr. Campbell, who probably did not know what applications Mrs. Lloyd herself had put on, and then he removes the cabbage leaf, and puts on a greasy plaster of *spermaceti ointment*, the very application that threw me back for three days. I cannot conclude, Sir, without observing, that it is a circumstance most deeply to be deplored, that ten days should have been allowed to elapse before Mr. Vance (so eminent a practitioner), who had attended her about two or three years ago, was called in, and when mortification had actually taken place. The result of an earlier visit from him might then have proved more propitious, and an amiable and valuable life might have been preserved to her husband, her family, and friends.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

WM. ABINGTON.

No. 3.

Bath-Place, Fitzroy-Square,
17th January, 1828.

My dear Sir;

I consider myself bound by every sentiment of gratitude and justice, to acknowledge the extraordinary cure which you have performed on me. I trust the time is not far distant, when the world will no longer remain in ignorance of your invaluable remedies. The cough, to which I have been subject for the last fifteen or sixteen years, invariably increased during the winter months; but, a twelvemonth back, I found myself attacked by a severe cold, which aggravated the cough to an alarming degree, so that in April last it was attended with frequent hemorrhage, purulent expectoration, together with restless nights, lassitude, and debility. Under these desperate circumstances, I had the good fortune to be made acquainted with the astonishing cures which have been effected by your new discovery; in consequence of which, I placed myself under your care, and am truly thankful to be thus able to state, that, in the short space of seven weeks, the cough and every bad symptom have subsided, and that my health is perfectly re-established.

In congratulating you on your success, allow me to add, you have my free permission to make any use you please of this letter, or my personal reference, which may be more satisfactory.

Remaining, my dear Sir,
most gratefully yours,
John Braithwaite.

To John St. John Long, Esq.
Harley-Street.

No. 4.

The following certificates were lately received by Mr. Long from Jonas Stawell, Esq. of Old Court, Doneraile.

DEAR JOHN ;

I prefer sending you the certificate on the other side without delay, with only the few respectable names annexed, which I procured on the spot, to waiting for the return of Lord Doneraile, who is not expected for some days here, or seeking for more signatures. I trust it may be of some use.

Most truly yours,

J. STAWELL.

To John St. John Long, Esq.
&c. &c. &c.
Dec. 11, 1830. Old Court.

We the undersigned, understanding that certain evil-minded and malicious persons have endeavoured to detract from the character of Mr. St. John Long, by representing him as having changed his name, as if to conceal who he was, do certify, that we have known him a resident with his parents in this neighbourhood from his childhood; that we always considered him not only a well-conducted boy, but of such promise in his early youth, as to attract the notice of the gentry of Doneraile especially; that his name was then John Long, after his father; and that subsequently to his going to Dublin to study at the Academy, he, at the instance principally of Mr. J. Stawell, of Old-Court (whose name is subscribed), added the family name of his mother, St. John, after his christian name; a practice which is not unusual for young men going into the world.

J. STAWELL.

Doneraile, October 17th, 1830.

I have known Mr. Long from his childhood, and always considered him an amiable and well-conducted person, and never knew him by any other name than that he now bears.

MICHAEL CREAGH,
Magistrate of Kilbrach, County of Cork.

We certify that the annexed, to our knowledge, is perfectly correct.

WILLIAM HILL.
RICHARD HILL.

Donnybrook House, Doneraile,
18th Dec. 1830.

I have known Mr. Long from his childhood, and have always considered him to be a respectable person, and have never known him by any other name than Long.

LUCY BELL,
formerly Miss L. Brasiar,
of Creagh Castle, Doneraile, County of Cork.

67, Cadogan-Place.

The following document, to the same effect, has been lately received from George Bruce, Esq., of Mill Town Castle, county of Cork.

When Mr. Long was a child, he lived near my brother-in-law, who has frequently told me that he knew him as John Long, and that his father's name was John Long; that his mother's maiden name was St. John, and I suppose he took the additional name of St. John on that account, as I knew him when living in Limerick, and have often been at his lodgings when he exercised the art of painting. As his family lived near that city, I should not have any idea that he could have an assumed name, as those who knew him from his infancy were in constant likelihood of seeing him. Prior to that, he was living in or near Doneraile, and was known by the same name; he was a year in my house, and I have seen persons

there who knew him from his infancy under such name as John Long or John St. John Long. They always conceived him to be rightly named. I never heard of his acting in any way incorrect or dishonourable since I was acquainted with him.

GEORGE BRUCE.

Mill-Town Castle, County of Cork.

No. 5.

An original document of a *certain physician*, Mr. L.'s medico-chirurgical enemy, has lately fallen into my hands; the following is a *correct copy*,—

"ST. JOHN LONG'S LINIMENT."

"Two correspondents of the MEDICAL GAZETTE, 'who "'have been endeavouring conjointly to find out the panacea' "of the renowned lung doctor of Harley-street, state that the "following liniment produces precisely the same effects as that "of Mr. Long."

FORMULA:

"R. Acid. Nitr. Muriat. ʒij
"Ol. Terebinth. ʒj
"Camphoræ ʒv—misce.

"P. Linimentum; or, which is better:—

"R. Acid. Nitr. Muriat. ʒij
"Ol. Terebinth. ʒj
"Axungis ʒv

"Melt the lard, and then add the other ingredients, stirring "the whole till quite cold.

"'Either of these liniments (says the correspondent) rubbed "' * * * * * * necessary.'"

"Gazette, 21st August.

"(11,790.)

" By NITRO-MURIATIC ACID we suppose the writers mean " an equal mixture of Nitric and Muriatic Acids; and, as " counter irritation is an important remedy in many affections of " the chest, as well as of other parts, we think a trial of the " application above-mentioned should be given, especially in " hospitals * * other public institutions where its * * " can be ascertained with precision."

" P.S. It might be kept in the shops as an extemporaneous " prescription under the name of 'LINIMENTUM NITRO-MURI- " ATICUM.' We mean to test its effects forthwith. In fact, " since the above was written, we have tried it. It is unchemi- " cal mixture, and the oil separates on standing. When agi- " tated, however, it forms a mixture sufficiently homogenous for " use. It does not redden the skin in the period mentioned " in the communication alluded to; but it proves a tubefacient " of some power, when applied for a quarter of an hour or " more."

I have copied this word for word from the manuscript in my possession, supplying some which are destroyed by stars, and even giving a trifling omission, in order to prove that what I advance I *wish* to be the *truth!*

A pretty document is this truly! So it appears that two wiseacres have been endeavouring to find out Mr. L.'s liniment; that having, *as they suppose*, discovered it, this physician takes it up, and advises this dreadfully corrosive preparation to be used upon poor creatures in hospitals who cannot resist their medical attendants, as also that it should be placed in shops as *an extemporaneous* prescription under a fine name. I dare say this son of Esculapius would think it very hard to be tried for manslaughter if any bad effects ensued from its use; I should imagine he would be as liable as Mr. Long!!!

PRINTED BY J. L. COX, GREAT QUEEN STREET,
Lincoln's-Inn Fields.